

REMARKS

Claims 1-19, 22-24 and 26-31 are now pending in the application. Claims 17 and 22-23 are currently amended. Claims 20, 21 and 25 have been cancelled. New dependent claims 30 and 31 have been added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AND §103

Claims 1-11, 16-24, and 28-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Schofield et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,498,620 B2).. Claims 10-15, 24 and 26-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schofield et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,498,620 B2) in view of Shimizu (U.S. Pat. No. 5,796,991). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 10 and 16

The “virtual point of view” of the claimed invention is not a real and actual viewpoint but rather, a virtualized viewpoint. On the contrary, the viewpoints in Schofield are real and actual viewpoints. Thus Schoefield teaches a different concept from the Applicants’ invention.

Claims 17 and 23

The “attention drawing region” of the claimed invention does not correspond to the markers of the road and other vehicles as in Schofield. Applicants have amended Claims 17 and 23 for clarification.

Claim 24

Schofield (col. 20, lines 41-62) merely discloses that the object in a blind spot of the vehicle has been highlight displayed. However, such disclosure does not suggest the feature of the claimed invention.

Claims 28 and 29

Schofield (col. 14, line 30 – col. 15, line 2) merely discloses that the data streams from image-capturing devices 14, 16 are mapped to the pixel array of display 20. However, such disclosure does not suggest the feature of the claimed invention.

New Claims 30 and 31

New claims 30 and 31 have been added as dependent claims to further clarify the aspect of the Applicants' invention whereby the virtual point of view is viewpoint-converted from an actual viewpoint.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Mar 18, 2005

By: Greg Stobbs
Gregory A. Stobbs
Reg. No. 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GAS/kk